



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1430
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,100	10/12/2000	Carl Phillip Gusler	AUS9-2000-0401-US1	9974
35525	7590	11/25/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/687,100	Applicant(s) GUSLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Brandon S. Hoffman	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 are pending in this office action.
2. Applicant's arguments, filed September 28, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Massarani (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,117).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claims 1, 8, and 15, Massarani teaches a method/system/computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system for filtering incoming data from an external computer network, the method/system/computer program product comprising:

- A firewall that is coupled to said external computer network (fig. 1, ref. num 126/127/135/136);
- A server computer system coupled to an internal computer network (fig. 1, ref. num 124);
- A plurality of clients that are coupled to said server computer system, said plurality of clients being unable to access said external computer network directly (fig. 1, ref. num 102/104);
- Receiving, at said firewall, a document from said external computer network (fig. 3, ref. num 308 and col. 6, lines 14-16);
- Determining, by said firewall, whether said document is from a known blocked site (fig. 3, ref. num 312 and col. 6, lines 20-22);
- In response to determining that said document is from a known blocked site, blocking, by said firewall, said document without scanning said document (fig. 3, ref. num 312 and col. 6, lines 20-22);
- Determining, by said firewall, whether said document is from a known safe site (fig. 3, ref. num 310 and col. 6, lines 17-19);
- In response to determining that said document is from a known safe site, forwarding, by said firewall, said document without scanning said document, all

of said plurality of clients being permitted to access said forwarded document (fig. 3, ref. num 312 and col. 6, lines 20-22);

- In response to determining that said document is not from a known blocked site or a known safe site, scanning, by said firewall, text fields included in said document for pre-selected keywords (fig. 3, ref. num 316 and col. 6, lines 27-29);
- Blocking, by said firewall, the document if any of said text fields include content that contains pre-selected keywords (fig. 3, ref. num 316 and col. 6, lines 27-29);
- Said server computer system being prohibited from receiving said document in response to said document being blocked (fig. 3, ref. num 316 and col. 6, lines 27-29); and
- Indicating that a site that sent said document is a known blocked site by adding, by said firewall, the address of said site to a filtering table (col. 6, lines 27-29 and col. 7, lines 25-30).

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Massarani teaches wherein the document is allowed to pass per standard service rules if the content does not contain pre-selected keywords (col. 6, lines 30-32).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Massarani teaches further comprising storing an indication in said filtering table of each known safe site that can be passed per standard service rules without having to be scanned for pre-selected keywords (col. 6, lines 30-32).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Massarani teaches wherein the step of indicating that a site that sent said document is a known blocked site by adding, by said firewall, the address of a site to a filtering table further comprises adding the address of the site to a "known-block" table when said site has sent a document that includes said pre-selected keywords so that the site will be blocked in the future without having its contents scanned for pre-selected keywords (col. 6, lines 27-29 and col. 7, lines 25-30).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Massarani teaches wherein the instructions for addition of a site to the filtering table are implemented in a strong text parsing language (col. 5, lines 32-39).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Massarani teaches wherein the instance of the filter is periodically refreshed to enact the updated filtering tables (col. 6, lines 33-40).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues:

- a. Massarani does not teach adding, by said firewall, the address of said site to a filtering table (page 9, last paragraph through page 12, first paragraph).
- b. There is no firewall in the Massarani reference (page 10, second paragraph).
- c. The dependent claims are allowable based on their dependency on the independent claims (page 12, second paragraph).

Regarding argument (a), examiner disagrees with applicant. Examiner agrees that Massarani does teach adding allowed sites to the list (see applicant's arguments, page 11, first full paragraph). Massarani does not explicitly say that blocked sites are added to the list (Massarani explicitly says blocked sites are blocked, but doesn't mention if they are added to the list), however, column 8, lines 4-6, say that various changes can be made therein without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention. Adding blocked sites for the same reason as adding allowed sites would be an obvious change that wouldn't depart from the spirit and scope of the invention. The idea is that a site that is a good site should remain good; the same applies for bad sites. For example, PBS.com is cached locally and determined to be a good site. PBS.com does not need to be scanned again because PBS.com will not become a bad site. On the other hand, a site that contains inappropriate content is cached locally and determined to be a bad site. The bad site does not need to be scanned again because the bad site will not become a good site.

Massarani also teaches adding sites from external sources as called for in the claim (see applicant's arguments, page 11, second full paragraph). The cited sections (col. 7, lines 21-30) show that in order to increase processing time, target content (content on the Internet that is trying to be obtained by the client) is cached locally and then scanned for the keywords once and only once. The information from an external network (Internet) is scanned, but is scanned from a local copy of a website to save processing time.

Regarding argument (b), examiner disagrees with applicant. Massarani describes a firewall in figure 1, reference number 126 (the proxy server). Proxy servers are well known in the art to be considered firewalls (column 4, lines 29-35). The purpose of the proxy server is to capture incoming/outgoing traffic and determine what to do with it based on rules (accept/decline, etc.). Also see column 1, lines 46-49, that says the blocking can be performed by a proxy or a firewall or any other device inserted between the user and the ultimate content source.

Regarding argument (c), examiner disagrees with applicant. Based on the response by the examiner for arguments (a) and (b), the dependent claims stand as rejected.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BH



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100